DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 232 976 SP 022 796

AUTHOR Smith, David C.; And Others
TITLE Reconceptualizing Teacher Education at the University of Florida.
PUB DATE Feb 83
NOTE 30p.; Symposium papers presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Detroit, MI, February 22-25, 1983).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Beginning Teachers; Higher Education; *Masters Programs; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Design; *Program Development; Research Utilization; Teacher Education Programs; Teacher Improvement; Teaching Skills
IDENTIFIERS Extended Degree Programs; *Operation PROTEACH

ABSTRACT

PROTEACH, an extended preservice teacher preparation program at the University of Florida (Gainesville), is a five-year program that culminates in a master's degree. Four papers describing PROTEACH are included. "PROTEACH: An Extended Preservice Teacher Preparation Program" (David C. Smith) provides an introduction to the program's goals, components, and development. "The Work of the Task Forces" (Suzanne L. Krogh), focusing on the professional studies component, reports on the workings of one of these task forces in detail. In "The Generic Teaching Component" (Dorene D. Ross), a research-based framework of generic domains was determined, focusing on: (1) ability to observe phenomenon objectively; (2) diagnosis of student abilities, learning difficulties, environmental conditions, and programs of instruction; (3) instructional planning and management; and (4) effective interpersonal skills. A summary is offered of the program's distinquishing characteristics in "Where We Are Now: The Process Described" (Suzanne M. Kinzer). (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED232976

RECONCEPTUALIZING TEACHER EDUCATION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

PROTEACH: An Extended Preservice Teacher Preparation Program
David C. Smith

The Work of the Task Forces
Suzanne L. Krogh

The Generic Teaching Component
Dorene D. Ross

Where We Are Now: The Process Described
Suzanne M. Kinzer

A Symposium Presented at the Annual Meeting of the
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

February, 1983

Detroit, Michigan

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Suzanne L. Krogh

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SP022 796

PROTEACH: An Extended Preservice Teacher Preparation Program

David C. Smith

INTRODUCTION

PROTEACH is the short-form name for the extended preservice teacher preparation program in the College of Education at the University of Florida. The program is designed to serve individuals aspiring to become elementary, secondary, or special education teachers. It is of five-years' duration and is expected to culminate in the acquisition of a master's degree. At its current state of development, the program is the result of three years of planning on the part of the faculty and administration of the College.

WHY AN EXTENDED PROGRAM?

The recent literature is abundant with concern expressed over the current state of teacher education. That concern is expressed over the general quality of the individuals entering teaching, in questions over the adequacy of the subject matter which teachers possess, and in doubts expressed over the rigor of the professional component in preservice preparation programs.

However, PROTEACH was not born out of apology or in the belief that the preservice preparation program at the University of Florida was seriously flawed or weak. On the contrary, innovation is created out of strength, not weakness. It was the intent of individuals at the University of Florida to design a program which was not bound by the restrictions of the past. For example, at the outset there

was no predetermination of a given length of time or number of credit hours or that a given component should be included.

Following extensive study, the faculty and administration of the College concluded that an extended preservice preparation program was the only logical alternative to current preservice teacher preparation programs. A number of factors contributed to that decision.

First and probably most important, there is a better, more reliable, and extensive knowledge base associated with teaching and learning than ever before. Specific reference is made, but not restricted to, the process-product research which links teacher behavior with student performance. Furthermore, researchers have recently been putting the research in a form conducive to incorporation into preparation programs, though much remains to be done in this area.

Second, it appears that society, at least by implication, holds an expectation for the preparation of more professional teachers. The current model of teacher preparation programs has served society well for approximately half-a-century. It is reasonable to conclude that the time has come for a major breakthrough in the manner in which teachers are prepared. Other professions increase their preparation time as those professions evolve. And in the past, programs for the preparation of educational personnel have increased in duration as well--usually at approximately thirty-year intervals.

Third, we concluded that current preservice preparation programs are not fundamentally faulty in design; they are inadequate in scope. During the course of our effort, all of the major recent

studies of teacher education were reviewed. The review revealed much more convergence than divergence in the components advocated in teacher preparation programs. An exception to this conclusion is the addition of the pre-education component to the PROTEACH program.

Fourth, it was felt that an extended program would result in a substantially stronger preservice program in the following respects. An extended program would permit greater study by prospective teachers in their various teaching fields. It would permit more orderly and comprehensive study of the research base related to teacher performance and student outcomes. It would permit the addition of a pre-education component in the areas of study undergirding education. It would permit a more sophisticated and extensive clinical component in the preservice preparation program. And it would make possible a five-year program wherein the fifth year is an integral part of the total program.

The matter of determining the level of support within the University for the development of PROTEACH was essential before initiating our redesign effort. Without support from within the University, any effort for major curriculum reform could not be expected to succeed. Several meetings of key groups within the College were held: they included the College Administrative Council, the College Development Committee, and the faculty at large at a general faculty meeting. Each of the groups expressed clear, general support for the design of an extended preservice teacher preparation program. The proposition was also discussed in detail with the Academic Vice President, who also expressed encouragement for the redesign of teacher preparation programs. He expressed

the view that bold, assertive, and creative action was the best defense against attacks upon teacher education.

It was also necessary to determine the level of external support for the development of an extended preservice teacher preparation program. The following agencies and organizations were regarded as very important in assessing the general level of acceptance for such a program and were contacted. The reason for contacting them was twofold: first, to make them aware that such a program was being considered; and second, to attempt to determine their initial reaction to the desirability of an extended preservice teacher preparation program. Those agencies were: the Office of the Commissioner of Education, the Office of Teacher Education, and the Office of the Governor. The organizations were: the Florida Association of School Administrators, the Florida Education Association/United, the Florida Teaching Profession/National Education Association, and the Florida School Boards Association. In addition, a number of county school superintendents were contacted to determine whether they would regard the graduates of such a program as desirable candidates for teaching positions.

All of the agencies offered cautious encouragement for the development of an extended preservice preparation program. All of the organizations, except the Florida School Boards Association, supported the development of such a program. The reactions of the county school superintendents were, in general, sharply divided. The superintendents from small, rural counties felt that the graduates would command higher salaries than they could pay. Those from larger, more urban counties indicated that they would make special efforts to recruit those graduates, if the program included newer and more comprehensive study and was not simply "more of the same."

THE PLANNING PROCESS

The planning process for the reconceptualization of preservice teacher preparation programs at the University of Florida has been underway for approximately three years. It is estimated that virtually every member of the faculty has been involved in some fashion in the process. It has necessarily been a complex process. A number of groups and steps involved will be described briefly.

The first major point in the planning process was obvious, but should not be overlooked. It was the conscious, calculated decision, after consultation with the faculty and the central administration, to proceed. That decision was also made after numerous discussions with individuals in the state educational community external to the campus.

Early in the reconceptualization process, a Planning Committee was formed. It included members of the faculty of the College; a representative from the State Department of Education; representatives from other departments and colleges on campus; a representative from the Florida Education Association/United; a representative from the Florida Teaching Profession/National Education Association; and a representative from the Florida Association of School Administrators. The purpose of the Planning Committee was to meet periodically to assess progress and advise the College on the extended program as it developed.

It soon became apparent that another group which could meet more regularly than the Planning Committee was needed. As a result, the Steering Committee was formed. It was composed of members of the faculty and drew its membership most heavily from departments which were most involved in teacher preparation. The group was especially active and involved in virtually every aspect of the PROTEACH process.

Later, following extensive work by the College of Education's Office of Planning and Information and the Steering Committee, the PROTEACH I Conference was held in the Spring of 1980. The conference was attended by members of the Planning Committee, teachers and school administrators from throughout the State, State Department of Education officials, and faculty. The purpose of the meeting was to pose three very important questions to the group. Those questions were: What should a beginning teacher know? What should a beginning teacher be able to do? What should a beginning teacher be? The group was also aware that the individuals prepared in this program would teach the majority of their careers in the 21st Century. The responses were collected and proved very valuable in the process of assisting in the reconceptualization process.

In order to establish a fremework for PROTEACH, it was necessary to identify the components for the program. The data collected in the PROTEACH I Conference were helpful in this process. The College had, a short time earlier, conducted a review of their teacher preparation programs, which was also helpful. In addition, other major examinations of teacher education programs were also reviewed in order to identify their major components. As a result of this effort, the following components were identified for the PROTEACH Program:

Subject Matter Content

General Education Content

Pre-education Content

Professional Studies Content

- Generic Studies
- Foundational Studies
- Subject Specific Studies
- Clinical Practice

In the Spring of 1981, a second conference, PROTEACH II, was held. The purpose of the conference was to share the work of the faculty with the professional community and to secure their reaction. It was also the purpose of the conference to acquire greater information relative to the knowledge base in teacher education. The Steering Committee was anxious to have the PROTEACH Program based in large measure on the research base relating teaching to learning.

Following the conference and further work by the Steering Committee, the Generic Professional Component was further conceptualized into three components—one with five subcomponents—as follows:

Teacher as Teacher

- Observation
- Diagnosis
- Instructional Planning
- Instructional Management
- Interpersonal Relations

Teacher as a Professional

Teacher as a Person

Following the formation of the Task Forces, they were requested to review and synthesize the knowledge which was important for a beginning teacher to know. This review required a great deal of effort. Much of the information was not available in a functional form and only very limited resources were available to the College to support this effort; consequently, the work of the Task Forces spanned several months. This work was, however, central to establishing the knowledge base for PROTEACH.

Other committees were active and central in the development of PROTEACH. Included was a committee which examined the nature of knowledge and served as a resource to the Task Forces. A Committee on Assumptions was formed and developed a set of explicit assumptions. It was felt that if the assumptions undergirding our work were explicit there would be less misunderstanding.

An Evaluation Committee, regarded as most important, has also been formed. The Evaluation Committee is charged to develop an evaluation system for PROTEACH, to collect base line data on the performance of graduates from the current preservice preparation program, and to evaluate the performance of graduates from the extended program.

In the later stages of the planning process, a Coordinating Committee was formed to replace the Steering Committee. The Coordinating Committee was composed of faculty drawn largely, but not exclusively, from the departments most heavily involved in preservice teacher preparation.

In the next section of this paper, the work of one of the Task Forces will be described in greater detail.

The Work of the Task Forces

Suzanne L. Krogh

The groundwork for our reconceptualized program has been laid primarily by a group of task forces. I will be sharing with you the workings of one of these task forces but, before I do, I'd like to tell you about the more general work that led to its formation. I think this is important because every step of progress we've made in PROTEACH has been made from a foundation laid by previous steps. In most cases, this progress has gone from the general to the specific.

In May, 1980, Dean David Smith convened the first major PROTEACH meeting and invited not only our college faculty but representatives from seven school districts, as well as members of the State Department of Education. A major part of the day was devoted to small group discussions which were conceived as an opportunity to brainstorm the following question: What should beginning teachers know and be able to do?

We were given specific instructions to free ourselves from the constraints of old, familiar, and comfortable programs, and also to identify large categories of knowledge and abilities rather than specific, detailed skills. The results of these discussions produced everything from broad, philosophical statements to lists of behavioral goals. It couldn't have been easy to pull together a sense of direction from all this, but somehow one of our faculty members summarized all that had been said, managed to place everything in some kind of category, and we were ready to move forward. I would like to say that we were off and running but, actually, we've ended up limping here and there. That is, of course,

to be expected in any major change, particularly when the people involved are of diverse and often antagonistic viewpoints. (One of the most positive experiences for me in this long process has been the opportunity to work with people of widely different philosophies and to find that, not only can we create a cohesive product, but that, frequently, we don't even have to do much in the way of compromise - there has been a surprising amount of common ground.)

A second major conference was held the same year and, this time, direction for PROTEACH came less from groups of faculty exchanging views, and more from the input of several guest speakers, most notably George Denemark of the University of Kentucky. He proposed a framework of seven generic teaching domains, which were adapted to our specific need by our faculty. As these evolved, they became:

1. Observation: The ability to observe a phenomenon objectively... one of the primary indicators, Denemark said, of a professional in any field.
2. Diagnosis: The analysis of student abilities, learning difficulties, environmental conditions, and programs of instruction.
3. Instructional Planning: Understanding of different types of learning, skill in defining objectives, and determining the sequence of instruction.
4. Instructional Management: ...of space, time, resources, processes of teaching, and student conduct.
5. Interpersonal relations:

6. The Teacher as a Person: We combined numbers 5 and 6 to include verbal and non-verbal communication, affective characteristics, leadership, and group process skills.

7. The Teacher as a Professional: The knowledge of legal obligations and rights, professional requirements across the entire spectrum of the teaching environment.

It should be emphasized that the overall task of working with these seven teaching domains was seen as generic, rather than specific. That is, we wanted to find what common threads there were between the areas and in what way these could be applied to the needs of every beginning teacher.

In choosing faculty members to serve on committees designed to explore the seven domains, an attempt was made to find as broad a cross-section of expertise and viewpoints as possible. Further, there was a desire to develop a reconceptualized program that would be research-based. So, the work of each task force became one of utilizing, first, the research done by its various members and, then, the research that would be reviewed from educational literature.

Finally, the various viewpoints and research data would be gathered into what we hoped would be a unified whole. We knew this wouldn't be easy in some cases, simply because research and points of view can take so many different directions.

That, then, gives you the background for the formation of the seven generic task forces. And now, I'll be specific and share with you the experiences of one of these - observation. My own experience and study concerning observation has pointed toward an ethnographic bias, and, although I chaired this task force, my point of view was very much balanced by the quantitative research and observation tools developed by other members of the committee. Once we had discussed and organized our ideas and research we found that we wanted beginning teachers to have a variety of observation experiences, skills, and attitudes. We wanted them to have a broad enough background that they could adapt techniques to suit the needs of a situation, as well as meet the needs of their own personal abilities and points of view.

Let me give you a couple of examples that show the diversity of our thinking. We believed that all teachers should be aware of the intellectual, psychological, and social impact of the physical environment on students. These should be observed by the teacher and adjustments in the environment should be made accordingly. Since this particular point of view was supplied by those with an ethnographic bent, the literature reflected this. For example, Doris Fromberg's book, Early Childhood Education: A Perceptual Models Curriculum, discusses the impact of space on the learning of young children, and this is dealt with both from a philosophical view as well as on a practical level. Another source was the writing of Edward Hall. For example, in his book, Beyond Culture, he discusses space as a means of social interaction and control. We saw this as having implications in the classroom as a component of acculturating students.

In contrast to this type of observation, we also looked at a variety of methods for more specific kinds of observation. Research -for example, that of Medley, Soar and Soar -has shown the effectiveness of low inference methods such as point time samples or rating scales.

Because the directions given to us at the beginning of our work were totally non-restrictive, we considered researching every kind of observation ever undertaken. We concluded that, if we were inclined to,we could research any number of things, even observation of teachers by the students. Having decided on some self-restraint, we eventually confined our report to observation by the teacher of students, the environment, each other, and even of self. To this, we added observations of beginning teachers by evaluators.

To achieve a well-rounded research base for what we believed a beginning teacher should know and be able to do, we relied first on the research that had been done by members of our group and then we turned to the literature. Because of our diverse ways of looking at observation, our final report seemed to us to cover a lot of territory. Yet, when we shared it with outsiders, they had their own points of view, too, and we would occasionally be asked why we hadn't included the work of the questioner's favorite writer on observation.

And therein lies, I believe, both the difficulty and the opportunity of laying a research base before beginning any practical endeavor. It was almost humanly impossible, of course, to draw on all the knowledge that has gone before us. Further, research didn't conveniently terminate

for us on the day we finished our report.

Being aware, then, that any recommendations we made would not be set in concrete, we submitted our report to the task force that was responsible for the next step: deciding what to do with all we had produced. This next group was to coordinate our report with those of the six other original task forces and begin to make recommendations for the implementation of programs. Dorene Ross will share with you the work and the results.

Operation PROTEACH: The Generic Teaching Component

Dorene D. Ross

When the faculty completed the research reports indicating generic knowledge which would form a partial basis for a teacher education program, the Steering Committee assigned the Generic Task Force the job of suggesting program elements appropriate to the teaching of a generic knowledge base. To help us in our task, we were given all of the generic knowledge base task force reports: Diagnosis, Instructional Management, Instructional Planning, Interpersonal Relationships, Teacher as a Person, Teacher as Professional, and Observation. Additionally, the committee reviewed and considered ideas contained in papers from the Airlie House Conference on the Study of Teaching (1982), selected papers by B.O. Smith (1982), and the first draft of the "Assumptions Underlying Operation PROTEACH (1982)."

The charge to the committee was quite broad and open, which meant that our first problem was to define the exact nature of our task. One major issue was the level of specificity to be included in our report. We discussed whether our task was to suggest possible ways to teach the generic knowledge or whether we were to design courses and instructional strategies within courses. The members of the committee decided they lacked sufficient expertise to design courses in such a variety of areas and that the task, therefore, was to look broadly at teach generic area and suggest possible instructional strategies. The guidelines developed by the committee might then be used as faculty members designed courses in their areas of expertise.

The second major issue the committee confronted was how to deal with disagreement among the committee. A variety of perspectives was represented in the faculty assigned to this committee and it was originally decided that it would be necessary to write majority and minority opinions in many areas. This proved to be unnecessary. In fact, the final report was the result of faculty consensus, not compromise, and the report that follows is an expression of our collective viewpoint.

Assumptions Underlying the Suggestions

The study of the available documents and our subsequent discussions of them produced a list of broad assumptions which became the basis for our suggestions about possible instructional strategies. The four broad assumptions which support committee suggestions follow.

1) Scholarly expression of thought is a generic component. Operation PROTEACH is designed to produce not only beginning teachers, but beginning teachers with a graduate degree. Any decisions concerning the teaching of generic components must be made with this in mind. The members of the committee stressed that the graduates of the new program must meet all criteria currently expected for students receiving a master's degree. Further, they should have attained the literacy and writing fluency of graduate-level students. There should be rigorous requirements throughout the students' programs, culminating in one or more of the following: senior paper or thesis, final project, qualifying examination, portfolio.

2) The focus of PROTEACH should be the development of professional, competent teachers rather than the teaching of a set of generic competencies. Although this assumption may seem self-evident, the direct statement of this assumption was particularly important to members of this committee. The committee defined generic knowledge as those areas of knowledge essential for competent teaching and stated that the program should focus on the development of competence rather than on attaining the discrete competencies identified. We considered as equally important the ability to synthesize and analyze in a comprehensive manner. This assumption was particularly important to us because the term "competency" has been linked with the notion of minimal competence and to focusing on documentation of the attainment of individual skills. The concensus was that everyone should not have to graduate with precisely the same generic knowledge and abilities. Everyone should be free to develop to the fullest potential and to exhibit competency in individual ways.

3) Beginning teachers with an advanced degree should see the interrelationship of theory and practice and be able to apply this knowledge in a professional teaching environment. Because theory and practice are dependent on each other, the committee had two major concerns about placing generic knowledge into a generic teaching component.

First, although much educational theory is generic, this does not of necessity imply it should be taught in a generic setting. There

was concern that teaching theory and research in generic, college-wide courses could lead to a loss of integration of knowledge the student must have in order to apply theory appropriately to specific situations. There also was concern that large college-wide classes might lead to sessions stressing lectures and memorization of knowledge for tests. Lecture classes are not necessarily a negative experience for students. Certainly, there are dynamic lecturers who are good at helping students learn to apply theory. However, the committee believed that lecture classes could lead to holding students accountable for a set list of generic competencies rather than for competence as teachers. This is precisely the learning situation that the committee hoped to avoid.

The second possible problem perceived by the committee was that the teaching of generic knolwedge would be done by generalists. Again, this in itself is not necessarily a bad experience for students. Yet, it is possible that many generalists lack the specific knowledge necessary to suggest appropriate application of theory for the various groups of students within one class. Students (or novice teachers) need help in application or the link between theory and application might be weakened. A team-teaching approach that would combine general content with specific application might serve to ease this conern.

Because of these two major concerns, the committee was quite conservative in assigning generic knowledge to a generic teaching component.

4) Faculty cannot tell students to "do as we say." The committee concluded that the faculty of the College of Education should give close attention to modeling the behaviors, attitudes, and teaching methods which they believe are indispensable for future teachers. Modeling should be incorporated as a part of the total program and should be regarded as both a teaching device and as an attitude.

Suggestions about Possible Instructional Strategies

Suggestions about possible instructional strategies were presented in the form of grids focusing on diagnosis, instructional planning and management, interpersonal relations, and observation. In developing the grids, the committee stressed that the grids provide a broad rather than a specific framework for the PROTEACH program. Further elaboration and specificity were believed to be the responsibility of individual departments and program areas.

A sample grid (diagnosis) is included in this paper. Before the grid is a list of definitions to clarify the meaning of the various instructinal components. The concepts listed on the sample grid, like those on the other grids developed by the committee, are as comprehensive as possible and thus cover much more that the beginning teacher needs to know. At the same time, gaps in our review of the pertinent literature may exist and new knowledge must constantly be added so the lsit of concepts cannot be viewed as complete. The committee stressed that each course must be fluid and each department and faculty member must make decisions about what is included under

the broad categories. In concluding the report, the committee stressed again that we agreed students should have knowledge in both theory and application, but that the individual concepts listed should not be viewed as discrete competencies that must all be mastered by the beginning teacher.

Clarifying Definitions

The terminology of instructional components may mean different things to different educators. For the purposes of the following chart, these are the definitions of the recommended teaching strategies.

Generic Courses: Courses which are taught in cross-subject or college-wide groups. May include the use of learning modules.

Age/Subject Specific Courses: Courses in which generic knowlege is presented in a way which has specific meaning to the student so that it may be applied to the student's own field of interest, (e.g. early childhood, elementary, special education, math education, etc.).

Team Approach: This combines the generic and the specific in a unified program. One model may be for theory to be presented in a cross-subject or college-wide group, then for the group to split into smaller segments for application of theory in a specific way.

Application: Refers to field experiences, clinical experiences, student teaching at any level, micro-teaching, simulation.

Modeling: As a part of the instructional strategies used in teaching a course, the faculty member models behaviors such as

the application of a theoretical perspective, the use of instructional strategies, or the use of a diagnostic technique.

Seminar: A course or group meeting in which students are expected to provide a considerable amount of the knowledge input with the help of a qualified faculty member. These may be for affective purposes such as a support group, and/or for the purpose of cognitive learning.

DIAGNOSIS: A Sample Grid

Generic Expectancies	Generic Course	Age/Subject Specific Course	Team Approach	Modeling	Application	Seminar
I. Diagnosis Techniques						
A. Tests & measurement component	X				X	
B. Test construction		X		X	X	
C. Informal methods		X		X	X	
II. Diagnosis of subject area skills and knowledge		X			X	
III. Diagnosis of background & needs of students						
A. Cognitive development		X	X		X	
B. Learning styles (including brain research)		X	X	X	X	
C. Physical development		X	X		X	
D. Socio-emotional development		X	X		X	
E. Experiential background of students		X	X	X	X	
F. Cultural/SES differences among children		X	X		X	
IV. Diagnosis of self as teacher/learner	X	X	X	X	X	X

Where We Are Now: The Process Described

Suzanne M. Kinzer

Faculty involved in writing the various Task Force reports previously described met to suggest next steps. The appointment of a small writing team resulted. This group was assigned the task of summarizing work completed to-date in the form of a general description of PROTEACH. Draft documents were produced, disseminated, and widely discussed in both formal and informal meetings. After much faculty dialogue, a PROTEACH conceptual statement received approval.

This statement was derived from the concepts identified by various Task Force groups and dialogue generated in response to two guiding questions: "What do teachers need to know and be able to do?", and "What kind of person should a teacher be?" The report identified distinguishing programmatic characteristics. We believe PROTEACH to be different from traditional programs in terms of curricular content, instructional procedures, the nature of students who will be attracted to the program, and the amount of time and the program will take. More specifically, the program has seven distinguishing features:

1) An increase in the time and quality of subject matter study. In the first two years, the curriculum will emphasize the development of general background knowledge from areas such as sociology, anthropology, and economics; and academic specializations in areas such as math, science, and English. The behavioral and decision-making sciences are included to provide prospective teachers with a solid conceptual background for problem-solving, decision-making and inquiry; and later application to teaching.

2) Utilization of the best information available about effective teacher's knowledge, skills, and personal attributes. The development of the PROTEACH knowledge base has been described in earlier sections of this paper. Our commitment and intention to keep the process on-going through research and documentation efforts is clear.

3) Expansion of foundational studies. This includes basic concepts from socio-economic and multicultural foundations, human growth and development, cognition and learning, exceptionality and mainstreaming, governance, tests and measurements, curriculum design and development, research interpretation, and computer usage.

4) Expanded clinical and laboratory procedures. These experiences include early observation and supervised field experiences concluding in an internship, as well as campus-based activities. Teaching skills derived from research and theory experiences through a series of clinical experiences will be continuous and closely tied to coursework. Supervision modes, including video taping, collaborative efforts with public school personnel, and application of clinical and peer supervision models are planned. Varied observation systems, including those in Florida's Beginning Teacher Program, will make up the assessment component.

5) Using the best available instructional procedures and technology. Simulations using video disc computer technology are envisioned, as well as other more typical media such as micro teaching and video taping.

6) Maintenance of program integrity. The curriculum is planned to avoid overlap and duplication by clearly identifying concepts and principles to be taught and practiced in clinical settings. The faculty is committed to on-going documentation and evaluation of the program, and of student progress for purposes of accountability and continuous feedback and revision.

7) Recruitment of high quality students. The program's academic rigor ensures high professional standards. An active campaign to encourage talented students to apply for admission is planned, as well as the maintainance of admissions policies with high standards. PROTEACH is envisioned as an extended program of approximately 32 semester hours beyond the baccalaureate degree, culminating in a master's degree for those students who meet graduate school requirements.

Following the approval of the conceptual basis of PROTEACH, a Coordinating Committee representing those involved in the three major teacher programs (Elementary-Early Childhood, Secondary, and Special Education) was appointed. This group had the responsibility for expanding communication and faculty involvement; suggesting guidelines for specific progrmmatic design; reviewing designs and coordinating efforts; and writing the report summarizing the newly designed programs for faculty approval and external dissemination. The design process involved day-long meetings with persons from the primary program area or department, representatives from other departments, the Dean's staff, and an outside process observer-facilitator. These groups had the task of arriving at programmatic agreements in five major areas: General Background Knowledge, Foundational Knowledge, Pedogogy, Clinical

Experience, and Program Integrity-Evaluation. Writing teams selected by each group then synthesized and edited the results. The Coordination Committee suggested parameters and ground-rules for this program development effort which included maintaining consistency with overall PROTEACH guidelines, utilizing the work of earlier Task Forces, and ensuring commitment to an extended approach to teacher preparation resulting in a master's degree. The reports from Elementary-Early Childhood Education, Secondary Education, and Special Education were reviewed by the Coordinating Committee and revised to ensure consistency across programs. This group used five criteria for program review:

1) program validity;
2) consistency with PROTEACH guidelines and NCATE standards;
3) identification of areas of commonality;
4) identification of issues raised by the three different designs;
5) highlighting of new elements in order to gain external support.

Faculty approved the three program designs in March, 1983, and groups are now involved in the hard work of continuing to identify program specifics and implementation procedures. The Coordinating Committee asks itself regularly if there really are any unique features or differences in the PROTEACH designs. We have concluded that the programs are longer and more comprehensive. They include academic and professional specializations which are based upon a systematic rationale. The programs look like preparation required in other professions. They include a heavy clinical component which will involve more than the "traditional" teacher preparation field experience models. Further, the acquisition of a master's degree represents minimum preparation. PROTEACH has been conceived in a thoughtful and rational way and is derived from the

best that we know from research and literature. The commitment to on-going evaluation and documentation--the establishment of a feedback loop--is a unique practice for most teacher preparation programs. Finally, and perhaps most exciting, are the course redesigns and revisions whic are beginning and will continue to increase and the opportunities for interdepartmental communication and teaming. The thought being given to what's important for teachers to know, be able to do, and be like can not help but result in the preparation of a talented and skillful breed of teachers for the 21st Century.